RESEARCH BULLETIN

CO-OPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN CANADIAN COLLEGES

WINTER, 1984

Province of Nova Scotia
DEPARTMENT of LABOUR and MANPOWER

Research Division

CO-OPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

IN CANADIAN COLLEGES

WINTER 1984

HON. DAVID NANTES

MINISTER

HUGH MACDONALD

DEPUTY MINISTER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
List of Tables	ii
List of Appendices	iii
Forward	iv
1. The Research Plan	1
1.1 Description of Phases I and II	1
1.2 Procedures	2
2. Introduction	3
2.1 How Co-operative education programs operate	3
2.2 Growth of Co-operative Education in Canada	4
3. Phase I: The Development of Co-operative Education Programs	6
3.1 Planning and Implementation	6
3.1.1 Start-up and Introduction of Programs	6
3.1.2 Methods of Assessing Attitudes and Financial Needs	8
3.1.3 Initial Reactions to the Co-op Concept	8
3.1.4 Choosing Programs to Operate in the Co-op Mode	9
3.1.5 First Year Experiences	11
3.1.6 Student Participation	13
4. Program Evaluation	15
4.1 Role of the Co-op Office	15
4.1.1 As a pivot	15
4.1.2 Pre-employment workshops	16
4.1.3 Recruiting employers	16
4.2 Concerns	19
4.2.1 Faculty	19
4.2.2 Students	21
4.2.3 Administration	23
5. Summary	24
Footnotes	27
Bibliography	28
Appendices	30

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

Co-op Student Enrollment in Canada 1982-1983 4

First Year Co-op Placement/Present Co-op Enrollment 11

LIST OF APPENDICES

		PAGE
Appendix A:	A descriptive inventory of all Canadian College Courses Operating in the Co-operative Mode	30
Appendix B:	Canadian College Co-operative Education Program Assessment Questionnaire	41
Appendix C:	Letter Requesting Support	57
Appendix D:	Questionnaire Mailing List	59

FORWORD

This study explored the processes used in implementing co-operative education programs at post-secondary, non-degree granting institutions in Canada. The purpose of this study is to provide the groundwork upon which decisions concerning co-operative education can be based.

This paper was prepared by Julie Thomson, a co-operative education student in The Bachelor of Public Relations program at Mount Saint Vincent University. The project was supervised by John Patterson.

Appreciated is expressed to Ivan Blake and Margaret Dykeman for their help and support in the initial stages of data collection.

Jean Dobson
Director
Research Division

1. THE RESEARCH PLAN

1.1 Description of Phases I and II

This study provides background information on the current status of co-operative programs in Canadian Colleges. Specifically, this report will cover several major areas in the development of co-operative education programs. Under planning and implementation the following areas will be explored: time needed to organize programs; methods used to assess attitudes to the co-op concept and financial needs; initial reactions to the concept; choosing co-op programs; experiences during the first year of operation and type of student participation. Two features explored under program evaluation are the role of the co-op office and general concerns of those groups directly involved in co-op programs, i.e. faculty, students, employers and administration.

The perceptions of the respondents to these areas will be interspersed with conclusions from the report entitled Implementation of Co-Operative Education Programs, (Wilson et al)[1]. Segments of the Handbook of Co-Operative Education, (Knowles & Associates)[2], and the ERG College Co-Op Review, (Environics Research Group Limited)[3] will also be incorporated.

1.2 Procedures

The following description of the appendices to this report will reveal the methodology used to collect the required data.

Appendix A to this report presents a detailed, descriptive inventory of co-op courses available in Canadian colleges including enrollment levels, length of courses, school/work sequences and type of participation required.

Appendix B is a sample of the instrument which was designed to collect the required background information from all colleges operating in the co-op mode. THE RESULTS FROM THIS QUESTIONNAIRE ARE THE ESSENCE OF THIS REPORT.

Appendix C is a sample of the letter sent to the president or director of each of the 15 colleges. Appendix D, the mailing list which was based on replies from that letter, are those individuals to whom the questionnaire was mailed. To insure 100% response rate as well as immediate results and complete comprehension of the questions by the respondents, data collection was completed by in-depth telephone interviews.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 How Co-operative Education Programs Operate

Co-operative education is a learning process whereby tangible, constructive work is incorporated into regular academic curricula. The co-operative method of education is designed to "close the gap" between education and vocation while ensuring that skills taught meet the needs of the industrial community.

In Canada, the University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, was the first institution to adopt the concept in 1957. Their program evolved into the "trimester system" where the school year was divided into three terms of four months each. The students registered at the beginning of the fall term and were required to attend classes for four months before being streamed into two groups.

One group went to work while the other group stayed in classes for another semester. At the end of this semester the two groups would alternate their school/work placements. This system continued until the second last semester before graduation; when the first group to be placed on work assignments returned to school for two consecutive terms. Therefore, the two groups came together for their final semester and graduation. This pattern, with slight variations, has become the normal co-op pattern in universities and colleges across Canada.

2.2 Growth Of Co-operative Education In Canada

The development of co-operative education programs in other universities occured rapidly: University of Sherbrooke - 1966, Memorial University - 1968, University of Regina - 1969. The number of institutions currently offering co-op programs in Canada is 37, that is 22 universities and 15 colleges.

The following table breaks down student enrollment at post-secondary institutions in Canada for the 1982/83 academic year.

CO-OP STUDENT ENROLLMENT *

IN CANADA 1982-1983

	Science & Technology	Business	Other	Total
College	4638	1900	1174	7712
University	7252	5971	1555	14778
TOTAL	11890	7871	2729	22490

Science and technology related courses include:

Technologies	Trades
instrumentation	heating & air conditioning
engineering	drafting
electronics	tool & die
electrical	machinist
drafting	welder
marine related	
computer	
data processing	

* Source: Canadian Association for Co-operative Education 1982/83 Directory.

Business related courses include:

computer studies

data processing

marketing

secretarial arts

retail

The first post-secondary, non-degree granting institution to incorporate a co-op program within its academic agenda was Mohawk College in Hamilton, Ontario. In 1969 twenty-four students were placed from the industrial management technology program. Today Mohawk has over 2,400 students enrolled in co-op programs. Currently there are 93 co-op programs available from Canadian colleges. Eleven of these colleges are located in Ontario, two in Quebec and one each in Manitoba and British Columbia.

In general, each work term placement is developed or approved by the college as a suitable and relevant learning situation. The students are monitored by the college during work placements. In most cases, students are given the same responsibilities as regular employees and receive wages. The students are required to complete work term evaluations which often must be accompanied by in-depth work term reports. After students return to classes, their performance is evaluated by both the co-op employer and the college.

3. PHASE I: THE DEVELOPMENT OF CO-OPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

3.1 Planning and Implementation

3.1.1 Start-up and Introduction of Programs

Time needed to organize co-op programs appears to be related to available funding. In 1977, the Department of Employment and Immigration contributed up to $100,000 per project toward the development of co-operative education programs. Two institutions which were operating co-op programs within a year were supported financially through this federal funding. However, whether government funding was accessed or not, the average organization time was two years.

Questionnaire results show that institutions were introduced to the co-op idea by administration, faculty and co-op personnel from other institutions. In the majority of cases, however, faculty and/or co-op personnel from other institutions were the prime innovators of the concept.

The co-op idea was then conveyed to the institution at a special meeting devoted to co-op education. The two primary reasons stated for adopting co-op have been to enrich the education of students and improve the employment prospects of graduates. Respondents felt that co-operative education would allow their programs to become more relevant to industrial needs. Pressure from local industry to produce highly trained professionals within their specialized area of expertise was stated by one respondent as the main reason for their conversion to co-op. Other reasons included developing better skills within students and hence more employable

graduates, attracting students to their institution and one respondent felt the reason was primarily to utilize existing grants and available funding.

In three cases the major force behind the implementation of co-op was a special committee, formed specifically to research and establish co-op. In all other institutions, chairmen of designated co-op programs, faculty members, individuals from administation or staff members were the dynamic force. The common element here is the conviction and dedication of one individual to the value and benefits of co-operative education. That person made it happen. Whether it was through soliciting the support of the institution's president, by involving faculty, by promoting the idea through a committee or by undertaking a feasibility study, the impetus behind successful co-op programs can usually be traced back to the efforts of one individual.

3.1.2 Methods of Assessing Attitudes and Financial Needs

Methods used during the planning stages to assess attitudes, financial needs and difficulties in actual implementation were varied. Surveys, meetings, feasibility studies, consultations, slow indoctrination and reviewing data available from programs already operating were all stated as useful instruments. Planning generally involved the chairman and faculty of potential co-op programs, career planning co-ordinators as well as advisory committees. Thirteen of fifteen colleges with co-op consulted with advisory committees from the onset of planning.

3.1.3 Initial Reactions to the Co-op Concept

Initial reactions of the groups affected by converting to the co-op mode range from "very optimistic" to "somewhat pessimistic", however, there were not any "very pessimistic" reactions. In general, students were the most enthusiastic about the prospects of change, both in initial reaction as well as support. College administration was the second most eager group followed by potential co-op employers and faculty. Faculty was the group that needed the most encouragement concerning the value and benefits of co-op.

Conversion necessarily alters the traditional teaching schedule from 10 to 12 months, therefore the faculty are forced to rearrange their normal patterns of instruction.

> "One of the difficulties encountered in co-operative education programs over the years has been the lack of support, and at times outright hostility, toward the system itself on the part of some faculty members, particularly those accustomed to the shorter programs of traditional colleges. They dislike the repetition of course materials, the shorter holiday and summer vacation periods, and the fact that they have to teach during the summer at all."[4]

Knowles also notes that faculty who are critical at first may in time become the most enthusiastic supporters of the programs because, among other things, they recognize the maturity of co-op students and the value of work placements in enhancing classroom teaching.

Questionnaire results show that although in the planning stages faculty were somewhat reluctant to convert to co-op, after implementation these attitudes changed. Thirteen of the fifteen respondents agreed that faculty of co-op programs are now "very supportive".

3.1.4 Choosing Programs to Operate in the Co-Op Mode

The needs of the industrial community was cited as the main consideration in choosing programs for conversion to co-op.

Because industrial marketplace needs fluctuate annually, many respondents expressed caution in portraying work placements in some fields as easier than in others. However, the current trend in ease of placement appears to be in the electronics and data processing fields, and in the retail and tourism areas. The commercial baking program at Red River Community College is particularly popular.

Co-operative education was designed to become an integral part of the entire educational process. The impulse exists to use the co-op concept to solve the economic and social problems of today. Because of this, co-op may evolve into a program with a different set of goals and objectives than it now has. The questionnaire results indicate that respondents feel economic

conditions greatly influence the nature of work terms for students, consequently reflecting back on the types of programs initially chosen to operate in the co-op mode. Identifying the needs of the labour market is therefore vital in discerning potential co-op programs. Open lines of communication with industry and business through a co-op liason officer facilitates the acquisition of placements for co-op students.

Faculty attitude is another prime consideration in choosing potential co-op programs. It was found that faculty support can be obtained by directly involving them in the process. During the planning stages decisions must be made which include faculty in areas such as evaluating students' work term performances and work term reports, work site visitations, and co-op employer consultations. All parties will benefit by the increased input of knowledge and experience of faculty members. The level of enthusiasm and support for the entire co-op process will then also be increased.

3.1.5 First Year Experiences

The first year of operation saw the majority of colleges employing one co-op co-ordinator and one clerical person. Other colleges such as Confederation and Dawson, did not have co-ordinators then and still do not. Co-op responsibilities are divided among members of the faculty. It is important to note the importance of co-op co-ordinators. They are the individuals who, among many other things, spread the gospel of co-op to other departments of the college. In this way, new programs are brought on stream and co-op expands. Both Confederation and Dawson respondents did not see those signs of progressiveness in their institutions.

The following table shows student placements during the first year co-op programs were operational at the indicated colleges. In general, the respondents believe placement during that first year was close to 100% of co-op enrollment. Therefore, the total 1982-83 co-op enrollment for these colleges is indicated to show the growth of co-op education programs in Canada.

FIRST YEAR CO-OP PLACEMENT/PRESENT CO-OP ENROLLMENT

	Number of Student Placements	First Year of Operation	1982/83 Co-Op Enrollment
Algonquin	50	1979	260
Confederation	20	1970	23
Dawson	22	1974	220
Fanshawe	65	1971	2,085
Georgian	No Answer	1972	784
Institut de Marine	24	1969	400
Lambton	50	1979	478
Mohawk	24	1969	2,430
Niagara	20	1976	332
Red River	152	1975	180
St. Clair	70	1979	135
St. Lawrence	15	1981	150
Sault	11	1983	35
Seneca	46	1977	155
Vancouver	8	1979	45

Sources: Canadian Association for Co-Operative Education 1982-83 Directory

Canadian College Questionnaire

3.1.6 Student Participation

Co-operative education programs require either mandatory or optional participation by students. By registering in a mandatory co-op program they are knowingly committing themselves to the extra demands and responsibilities this type of program entails. On the other hand, optional co-op participation allows students to choose between the co-op route or the traditional "classroom only" style of learning. Most of the respondents felt mandatory programs were more efficient. Because mandatory participation requires a commitment from both the college and the student at the outset, budgets and numbers of work placements needed are easier to plan. It is also believed that mandatory programs raise students' skills and academic standards to the same level.

On the less attractive side, mandatory programs have a built-in schedule rigidity which can be detrimental during difficult economic times. Questionnaire results have revealed two institutions that are now in the process of allowing mandatory co-op students to opt out if they cannot be placed during their scheduled work term. It is yet to be decided how teaching schedules will accommodate these students.

Another concern of mandatory programs is the damage which may be created in employer/institution relationships by students with poor attitudes toward work. This problem, however, can be monitored by screening applicants to the program. This raises the last consideration in deciding between mandatory or optional participation: student enrollment. Since all students may not be suitable for co-op programs, total student enrollment levels for

mandatory programs may be lower than for optional. Because co-op programs require more time and responsibility to successfully complete, some students may decide to enroll in the traditional classroom learning style programs elsewhere.

4. PROGRAM EVALUATION

4.1 Role of the Co-op Office

4.1.1 As a Pivot

The co-op office does not function as a separate entity. It is a pivot around which students, administration, faculty and co-op employers turn. The administration and operation of all co-op programs is monitored from this central point. Although the co-op co-ordinator's main responsibility lies in supervising the placement of students, other major duties include acting as liason between industry and the college, maintaining communication with members of the college administration and faculty, gathering data concerning co-op students and co-op employers, conducting pre-employment workshops, matching work placements with students and evaluating work term performances.

Within the institution, support is needed from a variety of departments to ensure successful co-op programs. All but two respondents felt that the efforts of their co-op offices were well co-ordinated with other departments of the college. As well as contact with the faculty and chairmen of co-op programs, it is felt that contact with admissions, registrar's office and student services is essential. More time for faculty to participate in co-op is needed. Finally, support from the upper levels of administration, particularly the president, is believed to be necessary for the promotion of successful programs through the co-op office.

4.1.2 Pre-employment Workshops

Pre-employment workshops play a key role in helping students adapt to the school/work cycle. They are also an important element in setting the tone of the student's entire co-op experience. By next year all colleges will have programs in place which cover such topics as resume preparation, interview procedures, the writing of work-term reports, requirements and conditions of co-op placements, career pathing, job search techniques and the nature of the employment market. In most cases, pre-employment workshops are mandatory for co-op students.

4.1.3 Recruiting Employers

> "In general, employers are favorably disposed toward the utilization of co-operative students. This does not mean that all suitable co-operative jobs for students are easy to obtain or that the co-ordinator does not have to sell the program vigorously in locating certain specific opportunities. Always the goal is to have the right job for the right student at the right time and in the right location."[5]

Our respondents felt the best methods of procuring employers were through personal contact and direct solicitation by the co-op co-ordinator. Co-ordinators must approach potential co-op employers with a marketing strategy. For instance, targeting works well. That is, to find out specifically which department in a business needs a student and work with the direct supervisor on a one to one basis. In that way, a personal network is built up which is reinforced by the goodwill students themselves build during work placements. Sometimes "services for services" works the best. If you are in close contact with employers and can help them fill non-co-op positions with skilled people, they will generally help

you by hiring students whenever it is possible for them to do so. However, all co-op programs need internal and external publicity to create a high profile. This can be achieved through a multi-dimensional public relations package which individually addresses the various sectors involved. Administration, faculty, students and employers each have specific interests and concerns. A deliberate effort to respond to them will require a well organized, pragmatic approach. All questionnaire respondents stressed the importance of co-operation and support from all constituent groups involved in the co-operative process. Although it may not be possible to satisfy all their special interest goals, it will be possible to strategically move toward a large scale co-op program if their interests are considered and satisfied whenever possible or appeased where satisfaction is not possible. By doing this, their special group interests will be discussed within the context of the primary objective of moving toward co-operative education. This type of strategic planning is necessary to achieve support for the co-op concept.

Students are usually assisted in finding jobs by the co-op office through job postings, employer background information, and the arrangement of appointments. The students are then interviewed by their potential employers and the details of salary and starting dates are worked out between the two. It was found that sometimes the co-op office will recommend students to potential employers based on their knowledge of the students academic performances, special skills and attitudes. However, in most cases the co-op office permits the employer to choose entirely on his own.

> "Generally the co-op department, through its co-ordinator and written outlines, attempts to ensure that the employer understands the content of the program along with the academic level of the students and the type of tasks they might be expected to perform. Also, certain employers sit on advisory committees which serve to examine the relevance of the program to the needs of industry."[6]

Because of this important interfacing between co-ordinator and employer, four colleges expressly discourage students from seeking their own placements. They feel all efforts to find work placements should be co-ordinated through the co-op office. In this way, employers will only be contacted by one party, will have a formal description of how co-operative education programs work and have access to the entire student assemblage. All other respondents, however, encouraged students to look for work placements themselves. In the words of one respondent, "We take them any way we can get them!"

Why do employers hire co-op students? Most respondents feel the main reason is to groom students for future permanent employment. It is believed that 50% of co-op graduates return to their co-op employer for permanent employment.

Knowles explains why this may be so.

> "Training costs can run very high with recent graduates, and there is no assurance that they will stay with the company... co-operative students tend to remain with their employers much longer than those who come to a company from another type of institution. Also, the introduction of co-operative students into company departments 'hung up' on one way of doing things can infuse new ideas into the operation and many times be prime factors in increasing a company's profit."[7]

The second most cited reason employers hire co-op students is to fill immediate employment needs with a source of temporary manpower. These two outcomes are similar to results from the ERG co-op review which found:

> "The most common motivation (for employers to hire co-op students) cited by 43%, is to create a resource pool of temporary employees from which to fill immediate employment needs. A reason only slightly less compelling but distinctly more far-sighted is to recruit potential permanent employees for their organization; 33% offer this explanation."[8]

Strong unions are an influential factor in determining work placements for students. Several respondents have had difficulties working with unions because they are very protective of their jobs. Some companies refuse to hire students because of union reactions. However, one respondent has been able to come to terms with unions by drawing up a contract which ensures that students will not take the place of regular employees. Yet, in general, most feel that unions are non-supportive of the co-op concept and are reluctant to negotiate student placements.

4.2 Concerns

4.2.1 Faculty

The concerns of faculty in institutions, where co-op programs are operating, focus on scheduling difficulties. Aside from the somewhat disruptive summer teaching schedule, scheduling difficulties lie in accommodating both co-op and non-co-op students in optional programs.

The following examples show the schematics of work term/academic timetables for a two year diploma program with optional student participation. All timetables must coincide to accommodate both co-op and non-co-op students. Therefore, all three timetables operate within the same program during the same time period.

EXAMPLE 1: FOR CO-OP STUDENTS

Year 1

First academic term: Sept.-Dec.

Second academic term: Jan.-April

Work term: May-August

Year 2

Third academic term: Sept.-Dec.

Work term: Jan.-April

Fourth academic term: May-August

EXAMPLE 2: FOR CO-OP STUDENTS

Year 1

First academic term: Sept.-Dec.

Second academic term: Jan.-April

Work term: May-August

Year 2

Work term: Sept.-Dec.

Third academic term: Jan.-April

Fourth academic term: May-August

EXAMPLE 3: FOR NON-CO-OP STUDENTS

Year 1

First academic term: Sept.-Dec.

Second academic term: Jan.-April

Summer: May-August

Year 2

Third academic term: Sept.-Dec.

Fourth academic term: Jan.-April

Summer: May-August

All examples show four academic terms and two work or summer terms. Courses must be repeated during the first two semesters of the second year to fulfill the requirements of the timetables shown in examples one and two. At the same time new material is introduced to non-co-op students during the second term of the second year, as shown in example 3.

This repetition and double teaching schedule sometimes causes problems with faculty unless faculty members fully support the co-op concept. Readjusting to these unusual teaching patterns may become a source of resentment for the entire program. Therefore it is significant to again stress the importance of faculty involvement in the planning stages of co-op programs. Results show that through involvement, faculty gain enthusiasm by having the opportunity to contribute to the formation of the program.

Faculty are also concerned with the relevance of work placements to the student's discipline and academic level. It is the responsibility of the co-op co-ordinator to ensure that work placements are suitable to the student's field of study and to match students with positions that are appropriate to their academic and skill levels.

4.2.2 Students

In general, respondents found that students are now realizing the lack of placement opportunities available to them. Also, since students must often relocate for work terms, they find the costs difficult to manage. It has been suggested that by putting students in a situation where they are totally responsible for themselves and must budget their money carefully, maturation and

independence are promoted. Sometimes work term positions do not meet the expectations of the students. This can become a very real problem and in one case led to a program converting back from co-op to the traditional mode. Both faculty and co-ordinators must be aware and understand the nature of the employment available to co-op students. Only then will they be able to help students perceive the types of positions they can realistically hope to obtain.

Both co-op students and co-op graduates are gaining a reputation for the quality of their academic preparation. Many employers hold a number of positions open for co-op students. One respondent, by request, continuously funnels students from the electronics program to employers in the Ottawa region, where the type of work closely relates to the type of program being taught.

Employers, too, are concerned with the lack of placements available to students. Hiring freezes have made it difficult for many employers to commit positions for co-op students. This is particularly distressing at a time when high productivity is essential to the good health of an organization. It has been reported that employers believe co-op students, who begin work with knowledge of the industry, are at least as productive as comparable full-time employees.[9] In addition, the employer's staffing costs are the same or lower than filling positions via the regular route. Because co-op programs have proven to be a valuable tool in recruiting permanent staff, employers who cannot participate during tight economic times may find themselves short staffed when the business cycle fluctuates again. In general the advantages of

permanently hiring former co-op workers is two-fold.

> "First, savings in recruiting costs are a distinct possibility ... and second, in the opinion of over one-half of all employers able to compare, graduates of CAAT (Colleges of Applied Arts & Technology) co-op students are immediately more productive than their non-co-op colleagues."10

4.2.3 Administration

Administration's main concern is the cost of operating co-op programs. However, the initial costs are counterbalanced by maximizing the potential of college facilities and by increasing the student body.

> "... the "streaming" of classes into two groups - one on-the-job, the other on campus - and the use of the third semester, furnish savings opportunities through higher enrollments and fuller utilization of both the college 'plant' and the faculty members.
> ...Direct costs are the most readily identified of those associated with co-op education; they encompass the cost of those resources clearly dedicated to the administration of the work term component of the program - job development, student placement and counselling. In contrast to academic programs, no overhead or shared costs are allocated to the co-op department in program accounting practices. Instead the co-op department itself is considered an overhead or shared cost which is allocated back to the academic program for which it is providing services. It is thus treated similarly to such expenses as the library, athletics and the registrar's office."11

Questionnaire results show that most institutions are now charging a co-op fee per student per semester which usually covers about 20% of the cost of placement. Estimates of cost of placement per student were $250.00.

> "The direct costs of operating the co-op department itself are not large, representing less that 1% of the total college expenditures. While the price of developing new programs is usually in the $475 to $875 range for each student placed, that of maintaining a mature program is (based on current experience) only about $250 per placement. ... co-op does increase the administrative work load of the college in such areas as registration, recording, counselling and of course the scheduling of teaching time."12

5. SUMMARY

Co-operative education programs are now firmly entrenched as an integral part of the educational process in Canada. The steady enrollment increase in co-op programs is a definite indication of widespread acceptance and expansion of the co-op concept by employers, faculty, administration, and students. This experiential approach to learning brings with it a unique package of policies and procedures. From the onset the implementation of co-operative education programs will need to be intricately planned and that plan must be properly executed.

The initial step in the plan is to establish the feasibility and adaptablility of co-operative education to the institution. Where institutions are private and directed through a board of governor's, such as the system in Ontario, the responsibility of the decision to proceed with co-op lies with the director or president of the institution. In institutions which are publicly funded and co-ordinated through a government department, such as technical schools in Nova Scotia, the decision would likely rest with the Department of Education. Usually this decision is influenced by faculty and co-op supporters from outside the institution.

A co-op co-ordinator should be hired soon after the decision is made to proceed with establishing co-op. That person will help design the program. An essential component of the program is the orientation of faculty and administration. Through orientation sessions, support and enthusiasm will be generated. Other publics to be addressed separately within the context of a

public relations program for the acceptance of this new concept includes potential co-op employers and students. An empathic attitude toward the needs and special interest goals of these four major groups-faculty, administration, employers and students, is necessary to promote the overall objective of moving to the co-operative education style of learning.

Choosing the appropriate courses for conversion to co-op requires specific knowledge of local marketplace needs. Open lines of communication must exist between the industrial community and the institution. Marketing co-op to employers requires a professional approach which utilizes established marketing techniques such as targeting and networking. Students can also be an effective catalyst for interfacing co-op with industry. After orientation through pre-employment workshops, students generally are equipped with the knowledge and attitudes needed to procure employers, on behalf of the co-op office, for their personal employment. During work placements the student's goodwill usually reinforces employer/institution relationships.

The costs of introducing co-operative education are considerable for the first inaugural years. The majority of the co-op department's budget, however, is charged back to the programs for which it provides services. Also, co-op students are charged fees which cover about 20% of the cost of placement. Therefore, the costs of maintaining established programs appears to represent less then 1% of an institution's total expenditures.

All indications point toward the growth of co-op in post-secondary institutions in Canada. Strategic plans for adoption

lead to success.

FOOTNOTES

1. James W. Wilson, et. al., Implementation of Cooperative Education Programs. (Boston: Northeastern University, 1975.)

2. Asa S. Knowles, & Associates, Handbook of Cooperative Education. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1971.)

3. Environics Research Group Limited. College Co-op Review: A Study of Cooperative Education in Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, (Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Colleges and Universities, 1977.)

4. Knowles, Handbook of Cooperative Education, p. 228.

5. Ibid., p. 123.

6. Environics Research Group Limited, College Co-op Review, p. 58.

7. Knowles, Handbook of Cooperative Education, p. 330.

8. Environics Research Group Limited, College Co-op Review, p. 88.

9. Ibid., p. 106.

10. Ibid., p. 106.

11. Ibid., p. 63-64.

12. Ibid., p. 84-85.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Burgess, V.E., Chairman of Co-operative Education, St. Clair College, Windsor. Telephone interview, October 26, 1983.

Cameron, Terry, Manager, College Marketing and Development, Lambton College, Sarnia. Telephone interview, November 14, 1983.

Canadian Association for Co-operative Education. Canadian Association for Co-operative Education 1982-83 Directory. Kitchener: University of Guelph, 1983.

Cawthorne, Rosemarie, Placement and Co-operative Education Co-ordinator, Niagara College, Welland. Telephone interview, October 31, 1983.

Environics Research Group Limited. College Co-op Review: A Study of Co-operative Education in Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Colleges and Universities, 1977.

Etherden, F.W., Senior Campus Dean, Seneca College, Toronto. Telephone interview, November 14, 1983.

Howard, Cy, College Director, Red River Community College, Winnipeg. Telephone interview, November 2, 1983.

Joyner, Charles, Dean of Engineering Technologies and Physical Education, Dawson College, Montreal. Telephone interview, October 27, 1983.

King, Paul H., Dean of College Programs, Confederation College, Thunder Bay. Telephone interview, November 7, 1983.

Knowles, Asa, S. & Associates. Handbook of Cooperative Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1971.

Metcalf, Mike, Co-op Administrator-Business Department, St. Lawrence College, Cornwall. Telephone interview, October 25, 1983.

Michotte, Captain, Assistant Director, Institut de marine du Cegep de Rimouski, Rimouski. Telephone interview, November 3, 1983.

Partridge, Gordon, Chairman of Co-operative Education, Mohawk College, Hamilton. Telephone interview, November 7, 1983.

Rowe, Patricia M. "Co-operative Programs: Especially Beneficial for Women?" Journal of Co-operative Education XVI (Spring, 1980): 50-58.

Sim, John G., Manager Co-operative Education and Placement, Fanshawe College, London. Telephone interview, November 14, 1983.

Spriggs, Al A., Co-ordinator Co-operative Education, Algonquin College, Nepean. Telephone interview, November 16, 1983.

Ulan, S.J. "Into The 1980's with Co-operative Education". Canadian Vocational Journal 17 (August 1981): 17-20.

Wadsworth, Roger B. "Public Relations Ideas for Co-operative Education". Journal of Co-operative Education XVIII (Fall 1981): 88-93.

Watson, Margaret, Chairman of Employer Services, Georgian College, Barrie. Telephone interview, October 28, 1983.

Williams, Joseph, Manager of Marketing and Placement, Sault College, Sault Ste. Marie. Telephone interview, November 8, 1983.

Wilson, James W., et. al. Implementation of Cooperative Education Programs, Boston: Northeastern University, 1975.

Wilson, James W., and Lyons, Edward H. Work-Study College Programs. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961.

Wuhrer, Fred, Placement Co-ordinator of Data Processing, and Kerr, Ralph, Dean of Instruction - Career Programs, Vancouver Community College, Vancouver. Telephone conference interview, November 17, 1983.

APPENDIX A

A DESCRIPTIVE INVENTORY OF ALL CANADIAN COLLEGE COURSES OPERATING IN THE CO-OPERATIVE MODE

INTRODUCTION

Definitions

Course length is broken into term blocks of 4 months each. Number of work terms, academic terms and total terms are indicated.

Work terms are indicated as either O = optional or M = mandatory.

Enrollment indicates numbers of students enrolled during the 1982/83 academic year.

"Schedule" identifies terms as:

F = fall academic term September to December
W = winter academic term January to April
S = spring academic term May to August
X = co-op work term
O = course not in progress
H = holiday or off-campus term
/ = term is split

(A), (B), (C) indicates groups of students enrolled within the same program but in different school/work sequences.

PROGRAM / INSTITUTION	WORK TERMS	ACADEMIC TERMS	TOTAL NUMBER OF TERMS	WORKTERM	ENROLLMENT	SCHEDULE YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4
Accounting Fanshawe	2	4	6	0	84	(A) FWX (B) FWX	FXS XWS	000 000	000 000
Air Traffic Control Georgian	2	4	6	M	70	(A) FWX (B) OWS	FWX XWS	000 X00	000 000
Air-water Resources Field Technology Fanshawe	3	6	9	M	45	(A) FWS	XWX	FXS	000
Architectural Technology Fanshawe	4	6	11	M	174	(A) FWH (B) FWH	FXX FWX	FWX XWX	XWO FXO
Architectural Technology Mohawk	2	6	8/9	M	190	(A) FWS (B) FWH	XWX FWX	FWO FXS	000 000
Bilingual Secretary Niagara	2	3	5	M	23	(A) FWX	FXO	000	000
Biomedical Electronics Fanshawe	1.5	1.5	3	M	7	(A) F X/W X	000	000	000
Business Administration (Finance) Dawson	2	6	9	0	30	(A) FWH	FWX	XWS	000
Business Information Systems (Business Data Processing) Fanshawe	3	6	9	0	135	(A) FWX (B) FWX	FXS XWS	XWS XWS	000 000
Chemical Engineering Technology/Technician Lambton	3/1	6/4	10/6	0	76	(A) FWH	FXS	XWX	F00
Civil Engineering Drafting Technician Fanshawe	3	4	7	M	56	(A) FWX	XWX	F00	000

PROGRAM / INSTITUTION	WORK TERMS	ACADEMIC TERMS	TOTAL NUMBER OF TERMS	WORKTERM	ENROLLMENT	SCHEDULE YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4
Civil Engineering Technician Georgian	3	4	7	M	15	(A) FWX	XWX	FOO	OOO
Civil Engineering Technology Dawson	2	6	9	M	100	(A) FWH	FWX	XWS	OOO
Civil Engineering Technology Fanshawe	4	6	11	M	142	(A) FWH	FWX	XWX	FXO
Civil Engineering Technology (Municipal) Georgian	4	6	10	M	28	(A) FWX	XWX	FWX	FOO
Civil Engineering Technology Mohawk	3	6	9	M	110	(A) FWX	FWX	XWS	OOO
Commercial Baking Red River	1	1.5	2.5	M	22	(A) F/X W/X S/O	OOO	OOO	OOO
Commercial Cooking Red River	1	2	3	M	53	(A) F/X W/X S	OOO	OOO	OOO
Computer Programmer Analyst Lambton	3	6	9	M	25	(A) FWS	XWX	FXS	OOO
Computer Programmer/ Analyst Georgian	3	6	9	M	85	(A) FWX	FXS	XWS	OOO
Computer Programming and Analysis Seneca	3	6	10/9	O	130	(A) FWH (B) FWS (C) OWS	FXS XWX FXS	XWX FXS XWX	FOO OOO FOO

PROGRAM / INSTITUTION	WORK TERMS	ACADEMIC TERMS	TOTAL NUMBER OF TERMS	WORKTERM	ENROLLMENT	SCHEDULE YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4
Computer Programming and Analysis (Accelerated) Seneca	2	5	7	D	25	(A) OWS (B) FWS	FXS XWX	XWO FOO	OOO OOO
Computer Systems Technician Algonquin	2	4	6	M	25	(A) FWX	FXS	OOO	OOO
Computer Systems Technology Mohawk	3	6	9	M	440	(A) FWX	FXS	XWS	OOO
Construction Technology Fanshawe	4	6	10	M	133	(A) FWX	FWX	XWS	XOO
Control Engineering Technology (Systems) Fanshawe	4	6	11	M	32	(A) FWH	FWX	XWX	FXO
Data Processing Mohawk	2	3	5	M	163	(A) FXS	XWO	OOO	OOO
Data Processing Vancouver	2	4	6	D	45	(A) FWX	FXS	OOO	OOO
Digital Engineering Technician Algonquin	2	4	6	M	60	(A) FWX	FXS	OOO	OOO
Electrical Engineering Technician Fanshawe	3	4	7	M	84	(A) FWX	XWX	FOO	OOO
Electrical Engineering Technician/Technology (Power/Control) Georgian	4	5	10	M	105	(A) FWX	FXS	XWX	FOO

PROGRAM / INSTITUTION	WORK TERMS	ACADEMIC TERMS	TOTAL NUMBER OF TERMS	WORKTERM	ENROLLMENT	SCHEDULE YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4
Electrical Engineering Technology Fanshawe	3	5	11	M	19	(A) FWH	FWX	XWX	FXO
Electrician Mohawk	6	3	9	M	85	(A) FWX	XXS	XXX	OOO
Electronics Engineering Technology Algonquin	3	6	9	O	60	(A) FWS	XWX	FXS	OOO
Electronics Engineering Technician Algonquin	2	4	6	O	75	(A) FWX	FXS	OOO	OOO
Electronics Engineering Technology Lambton	3	6	10	O	50	(A) FWH	FXS	XWX	FOO
Electrotechnology (Computer Electronics, Electrical Control, Electronics Engineering) Mohawk	3	6	9	M	400	(A) FWS	XWX	FXS	OOO
Energy Systems Technology Mohawk	3	6	9	M	60	(A) FWS	XWX	FXS	OOO
Engineering Design Technician Fanshawe	3	4	7	M	87	(A) FWX	XWX	FOO	OOO
Fashion Design Fanshawe	3	6	9	M	95	(A) FWS	XWX	FXS	OOO
Fitter Welder Mohawk	6	3	9	M	85	(A) FWX	XXS	XXX	OOO
General Machinist Co-op Apprenticeship Fanshawe	6	2	8	M	80	(A) FXX	XWX	XXO	OOO

PROGRAM INSTITUTION	WORK TERMS	ACADEMIC TERMS	TOTAL NUMBER OF TERMS	WORKTERM	ENROLLMENT	SCHEDULE YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4
Heating Refrigeration Air Conditioning Technology Fanshawe	3	7	10	N	38	(A) FWX	FWX	XWS	FOO
Industrial Design Fanshawe	3	6	9	N	40	(A) FWX	FWX	XWS	OOO
Industrial Engineering Technology St. Clair	3	7	10	N	45	(A) FWS	FXS	XWX	FOO
Industrial Hygiene Technology Lambton	3	6	10	O	39	(A) FWH	FXW	XWX	FOO
Industrial Management Niagara	2.5	5.5	8	O	15	(A) FWX	F W S/X	XWO	OOO
Industrial Management (Business Administration) St. Lawrence	2	6	8	O	25	(A) FWX	FWX	FWO	OOO
Industrial Management Technology Mohawk	3	6	9	N	95	(A) FWS	XWX	FXS	OOO
Instrumentation & Control Engineering Technology Lambton	3	6	10	O	18	(A) FWH	FXS	XWX	FOO
Instrumentation Engineering Technology Algonquin	3	3	6	N	40	(A) FXS	XWX	OOO	OOO
Insurance Administration Mohawk	2	4	6	N	120	(A) FWX (B) FWS	FXS XXS	OOO OOO	OOO OOO
Interior Design Fanshawe	3	6	9	N	130	(A) FWX	FWX	XWS	OOO

PROGRAM / INSTITUTION	WORK TERMS	ACADEMIC TERMS	TOTAL NUMBER OF TERMS	WORKTERM	ENROLLMENT	SCHEDULE YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4
Landscape Design Fanshawe	3	6	9	M	50	(A) FWX	FWX	XWS	000
Law and Security Administration (customs option) Fanshawe	3	4	7	M	38	(A) FWX	XWX	FOO	000
Legal Assistant Niagara	2	3	5	M	60	(A) FWX	XWO	000	000
Legal Office Administration Fanshawe	2	4	6	M	85	(A) FWX (B) FWX	XWS FXS	000 000	000 000
Machinist Mohawk	6	3	9	M	85	(A) FWX	XXS	XXX	000
Manufacturing Engineering Technician Fanshawe	2	5	7	M	64	(A) FWX	XWS	FOO	000
Manufacturing Engineering Technology Fanshawe	3	7	10	M	77	(A) FWX	FWX	XWS	FOO
Marine Engineering Technology Georgian	4	5	10	M	70	(A) 0 0 0/X	X/F W S/X	X/F X/W S/X	X/F X/W S/O
Marine Navigation Technology Georgian	4.5	4.5	10	M	70	(A) 0 0 0/X	X W S/X	X W S/X	X W S/O
Marketing Fanshawe	2	4	6	0	30	(A) FWX (B) FWX	FXS XWS	000 000	000 000
Marketing Mohawk	2	4	6	M	167	(A) FWX (B) FWS (C) FWX	XWS XXF FXS	000 000 000	000 000 000
Marketing (Business Administration) St. Lawrence	2	6	8	0	40	(A) FWX	FWX	FWO	000

PROGRAM INSTITUTION	WORK TERMS	ACADEMIC TERMS	TOTAL NUMBER OF TERMS	WORKTERM	ENROLLMENT	SCHEDULE YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4
Mechanic Mohawk	6	3	9	M	85	(A) FWX	XXS	XXX	000
Mechanical Drafting Lambton	4	1	6	O	6	(A) FWH	FXS	000	000
Mechanical Engineering Technician/Technology (Design Option, Industrial Option) Georgian	4	6	10	M	50	(A) FWX	FXS	XWX	F00
Mechanical Engineering Technology (Mobile Equipment) Fanshawe	5	6	11	M	85	(A) FWX	XWX	FXX	FW0
Mechanical Engineering Technology Lambton	3	6	10	O	39	(A) FWH	FXS	XWX	F00
Mechanical Engineering Technology (Design, Production) Mohawk	3	6	9	M	199	(A) FWS	XWX	FXS	000
Mechanical Engineering Technology St. Clair	3	7	10	M	90	(A) FWS	FXS	XWX	F00
Metallurgical Engineering Technician Fanshawe	3	4	7	M	51	(A) FWX	FXX	F00	000
Microcomputer Engineering Technology St. Lawrence	3	6	9	M	85	(A) FWS	XWX	FXS	000
Nautical Sciences & Technology Navigation (Marine Eng.) Cegep de Rimouski	4	6	11	M	400	(A) FWX	FXH	XWX	FW0

PROGRAM / INSTITUTION	WORK TERMS	ACADEMIC TERMS	TOTAL NUMBER OF TERMS	WORKTERM	ENROLLMENT	SCHEDULE			
						YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4
Parks Operations and Services Lambton	2	4	6	M	20	(A) FWX	XWS	000	000
Programme Bilingue de Tourisme - (Tours et Attractions) Niagara	2	3	5	M	27	(A) FWX	FXO	000	000
Pulp and Paper Engineering Technology Sault	3	6	9	O	35	(A) FWX	FXS	XWS	000
Resources Engineering Technology (Environmental) Georgian	4	6	10	M	23	(A) FWX	XWX	FWX	F00
Retail Management Dawson	1	4	5	O	90	(A) FWX	FWO	000	000
Retail Management Niagara	2	3	5	M	52	(A) FWX	F/X W/X O	000	000
Science Laboratory Technology Fanshawe	3	6	9	M	80	(A) FWX	FXS	XWS	000
Secretarial Arts Niagara	2	3	5	M	93	(A) FWX	FXO	000	000
Survey Technician Confederation	1.5	3.5	5	M	23	(A) FWX	X/F W O	000	000
Survey Technician Fanshawe	3	4	7	M	44	(A) FWX	XWX	F00	000
Survey Technician Georgian	4	4	8	M	80	(A) FWX	XWX	XWO	000

PROGRAM INSTITUTION	WORK TERMS	ACADEMIC TERMS	TOTAL NUMBER OF TERMS	WORKTERM	ENROLLMENT	SCHEDULE YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4
Tool and Die Mohawk	6	3	9	N	60	(A) FWX	XXS	XXX	000
Tourism (Tours & Attractions) Niagara	2	3	5	N	62	(A) FWX	FXO	000	000
Tourism Management (Marketing research, planning & devel.) Georgian	2	6	8	N	188	(A) FWX	FWX	FWO	000
Tourism and Travel Counsellor Fanshawe	2	4	6	N	65	(A) FWX	FXS	000	000
Transportation Planning Technology Mohawk	3	6	9	N	71	(A) FWS	XWX	SXS	000
Urban Design Fanshawe	3	6	9	N	35	(A) FWX	FWX	XWS	000

APPENDIX B

CANADIAN COLLEGE CO-OPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

IDENTIFICATION:

COLLEGE: Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

RESPONDENT: Name: _____

Title: _____

DATE: _____

1. In what year did your institution become aware of the co-op concept?

_____

2. How much time elapsed between your institutions first awareness of the co-op concept and the first year students were placed? _____

_____

3. How was your institution first introduced to the co-op idea? (Circle the number corresponding to your answer.)

1 THROUGH A FACULTY MEMBER

2 CO-OP PERSONNEL FROM OTHER INSTITUTIONS

3 CONTACT WITH CO-OP EMPLOYEE

4 CONTACT WITH CO-OP STUDENTS FROM OTHER INSTITUTIONS

5 THROUGH GOVERNMENT

6 THROUGH ONE INDIVIDUAL ON STAFF

7 OTHER, SPECIFY _____

4. How was the idea conveyed to the institution? (Circle number)

1 AT A SPECIAL MEETING DEVOTED TO CO-OP ED

2 AT A MEETING DEVOTED TO ANOTHER TOPIC

3 AT A CONFERENCE

4 OTHER, SPECIFY _____

5. What would you say were the reasons your institution adopted co-operative education - in order of importance? 1 = most important

__ TO DISTINGUISH THE INSTITUTION ITSELF (to potential students, to the community)

__ TO BOOST DECLINING STUDENT ENROLLMENT

__ TO UTILIZE EXISTING GRANTS AND AVAILABLE FUNDING

__ TO ASSIST STUDENTS IN EMPLOYMENT AFTER GRADUATION

__ OTHER, SPECIFY _____

6. We are interested in the initial reactions of the following groups of people to the co-op idea. Generally speaking, would you say the reactions were very optimistic, somewhat optimistic, somewhat pessimistic or very pessimistic by: (circle answer)

FACULTY	Very Optimistic	Somewhat Optimistic	Somewhat Pessimistic	Very Pessimistic
ADMINISTRATION	Very Optimistic	Somewhat Optimistic	Somewhat Pessimistic	Very Pessimistic
POTENTIAL CO-OP EMPLOYERS	Very Optimistic	Somewhat Optimistic	Somewhat Pessimistic	Very Pessimistic
STUDENTS	Very Optimistic	Somewhat Optimistic	Somewhat Pessimistic	Very Pessimistic

7. Overall, would you say these groups were very supportive, somewhat supportive, not at all supportive:

FACULTY	Very Supportive	Somewhat Supportive	Not At All Supportive
ADMINISTRATION	Very Supportive	Somewhat Supportive	Not At All Supportive
POTENTIAL CO-OP EMPLOYERS	Very Supportive	Somewhat Supportive	Not At All Supportive
STUDENTS	Very Supportive	Somewhat Supportive	Not At All Supportive

8. What would you say was the one major force which led to the implementation of co-op education in your institution? (circle number)

1 COMMITTEE, SPECIFY NAME _____

2 ONE INDIVIDUAL, SPECIFY TITLE _____

3 DEPARTMENT, SPECIFY NAME _____

4 OTHER RESPONSES, SPECIFY _____

9. Before the program was actually implemented, please indicate the order in which the following groups of people lent their support to the co-op idea.

__ FACULTY OF THOSE PROGRAMS WHICH WERE TO BECOME CO-OP

__ FACULTY OF PROGRAMS WHICH WERE NOT LIKELY TO BECOME CO-OP

__ COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

__ STUDENTS

__ EMPLOYERS

10. In the planning stage, how were the following assessed?

OBSTACLES TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

_____

FINANCIAL NEEDS

_____

ATTITUDES OF: EMPLOYERS _____

FACULTY _____

ADMINISTRATION _____

STUDENTS _____

11. Which departments were actually involved in the planning stages of the program?

_____

_____

12. What were the three main considerations in choosing the first programs to become co-operative education programs?

1 _____

2 _____

3 _____

We are interested in your experiences during the first year the program was implemented.

13. During that first year, who co-ordinated the co-op program? (circle number)

    1 INSTRUCTORS

    2 STAFF FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS

    3 CO-OP STAFF

    4 OTHER, SPECIFY _____

14. During the first year, how many full-time staff did the co-op office employ?

    _____

15. During the first year, how many students were placed? _____

16. In which fields did employers contact you for students before you contacted them?

    _____

    _____

17. Could you meet the demand for students in all fields? (circle number)

    1 YES If yes skip to Question 19

    2 NO

18. In which fields could you not meet the demands of the employers?

    _____

    _____

19. Rank the departments from most to least difficulty of placement.

    _____ _____

    _____ _____

    _____ _____

20. What do you think are the main reasons some are more difficult than others?

_____

_____

21. Did the co-op department ever use an advisory board either formally or informally? (circle number)

1 YES

2 NO If you never used an advisory board, skip to Question 23

22. When was it first consulted? (circle number)

1 DURING PLANNING STAGES

2 YEAR 1 OF PROGRAM

3 YEAR 2 OF PROGRAM

4 OTHER, SPECIFY _____

23. Do students participate in pre-employment workshops? (circle number)

1 YES

2 NO Skip to Question 27

24. What types of workshop(s) is/are offered? (circle number)

1 RESUME WRITING

2 CONDUCTING INTERVIEWS

3 ON-THE-JOB RESPONSIBILITIES

4 WRITING WORK-TERM REPORTS

5 OTHER, SPECIFY _____

25. Are these workshops mandatory?

1 YES Skip to Question 27

2 NO

26. What percentage of the students participate in them? (circle number)

    1 LESS THAN 20%

    2 20% - 60%

    3 60% - 90%

    4 90% - 100%

27. Do you feel that the efforts of the co-op office are well co-ordinated with other departments of the university? (circle number)

    1 YES Skip to Question 29

    2 NO

28. Why do you feel this is so? _____

    _____

29. With which departments do you have the most contact?

    _____

    _____

30. How could better working relationships be built between the co-op office and other departments of your institution? _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

31. What is the one method you would say is the most effective in procuring employers?

    _____

    _____

32. How are students assisted by the co-op office in making contact with potential employers.

    _____

    _____

33. What percentage of initial contact with co-op employers was made by:

STUDENTS _____%

CO-OP STAFF _____%

EMPLOYERS CONTACTING THE UNIVERSITY _____%

OTHER, SPECIFY _____%

We have been talking about the planning and implementation stages of your co-op program. Now we will move on to an overall evaluation of the program.

34. What one thing about the co-op program would you say it is best known for?

_____

_____

35. Why do you think this is true?

_____

_____

36. As you look ahead to the next calendar year, what aspects of the program do you hope to see improved? (circle all appropriate number(s))

1 BUDGET

2 ADDITIONAL STAFF

3 MORE CO-ORDINATION WITH OTHER DEPARTMENTS

4 LARGER OFFICE

5 MORE PUBLICITY ABOUT PROGRAM

6 OTHER, SPECIFY _____

37. What three attributes in particular do you look for in considering students for placements?

1 _____

2 _____

3 _____

38. Are you in favor or do you oppose mandatory co-op participation rather than optional participation? (circle number)

    1 IN FAVOUR

    2 OPPOSED

39. What do you think would be gained by mandatory co-op participation?

_____

_____

40. What do you think would be lost by mandatory co-op participation?

_____

_____

41. To what degree would you say the co-op program is supported now by the following groups of people. (circle answer)

FACULTY OF CO-OP PROGRAMS	Very Supportive	Somewhat Supportive	Not At All Supportive
FACULTY OF NON CO-OP PROGRAMS	Very Supportive	Somewhat Supportive	Not At All Supportive
COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION	Very Supportive	Somewhat Supportive	Not At All Supportive
STUDENTS	Very Supportive	Somewhat Supportive	Not At All Supportive
EMPLOYERS	Very Supportive	Somewhat Supportive	Not At All Supportive

42. In addition to the benefits of co-op programs received by the students, check other specific benefits your institution has enjoyed.

    1 EQUIPMENT DONATION

    2 RESEARCH CONTRACTS

    3 SPECIAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS OR FUNDING

    4 WORK CONTRACTS, SPECIFY _____

    5 OTHER, SPECIFY _____

43. In order of priority mark the reasons you feel employers hire co-op students. 1 = most important

__ TO BENEFIT FROM A WAGE SUBSIDY PROGRAM

__ TO UTILIZE STUDENTS' KNOWLEDGE

__ TO GROOM STUDENTS FOR FUTURE PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

__ OTHER, SPECIFY _____

44. What one main force has had the most influence in directing the efforts of the co-op department?

_____

45. What is the one main criticism you have heard about the co-op program by:

FACULTY

_____

STUDENTS

_____

EMPLOYERS

_____

ADMINISTRATION

_____

46. Do you monitor the employment success of your students after graduation?

1 YES Skip to Question 50

2 NO

47. Do you have statistics that indicate co-op students employment success after graduation?

1 YES

2 NO Skip to Question 50

48. Indicate employment percentage for the following groups of students.

Co-op graduates employed one year after graduation

MALES _____%

FEMALES _____%

Non co-op graduates employed one year after graduation

MALES _____%

FEMALES _____%

49. What proportion of co-op graduates are employed by former co-op employers.

MALES _____%

FEMALES _____%

50. Would you say co-op students are more successful, about the same, or less successful than non co-op graduates in obtaining employment? (circle number)

1 MORE SUCCESSFUL

2 ABOUT THE SAME

3 LESS SUCCESSFUL

51. Has the co-op program increased, remained about the same, or decreased in each of the following respects. (circle answer)

ENROLLMENT	Increased	Remained The Same	Decreased
NUMBER OF NEW PROGRAMS	Increased	Remained The Same	Decreased
NUMBER OF DEPARTMENTS INVOLVED	Increased	Remained The Same	Decreased
NUMBER OF FACULTY INVOLVED	Increased	Remained The Same	Decreased

OTHER, SPECIFY _____

52. Do you see any other indications of progressiveness in the co-op program?

_____

_____

53. Has a cost benefit evaluation ever been carried out by your institution?

1 YES

2 NO Skip to Question 55

54. Specify the benefits evaluated.

_____

_____

55. What is the nature of the employment base around your institution?

_____

_____

56. Do you see a direct relationship between this employment base and the demand for co-op students?

_____

_____

57. What proportion of co-op students are placed within a 20 mile radius of your institution?

_____

_____

58. What is the population of the community in which your institution is based?

_____

_____

We would like to understand the effect unions have on co-op programs. The next set of questions pertains to co-op students and their work experiences within organized labour.

59. Did initial union reaction influence decisions regarding which courses would become co-op programs?

_____

_____

60. Have you ever placed co-op students in positions under the jurisdiction of a bargaining unit?

1 YES

2 NO, WHY? Skip to Question 66

_____

_____

61. With whom did you make the initial contact?

_____

_____

62. After initial contact was made, with whom did you negotiate final placement?

_____

_____

63. How are these placements different from those within non-unionized organizations?

_____

_____

64. Overall, how would you describe the receptiveness by unions of the co-op concept? (circle number)

1 VERY RECEPTIVE

2 SOMEWHAT RECEPTIVE

3 NOT AT ALL RECEPTIVE

65. How would you describe the degree of satisfaction with job placements by returning students from the following categories: (circle number)

Students placed at jobs which were under the jurisdiction of a bargaining unit.

1 VERY SATISFIED

2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED

3 NOT AT ALL SATISFIED, SPECIFY WHY

_____

_____

Students placed at jobs which were <u>not</u> under the jurisdiction of a bargaining unit.

1 VERY SATISFIED

2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED

3 NOT AT ALL SATISFIED, SPECIFY WHY

_____

_____

66. General information concerning funding would be very helpful to us in assessing the financial committment needed to set up a co-operative education program. The final set of questions focuses on financial considerations for the adoption of a co-op program.

Approximately how much funding was received for the adoption of your co-op program?

INTERNAL SOURCES $_____

EXTERNAL SOURCES $_____

If "0" skip to Question 69

67. What were the sources of the external funding?

_____

_____

68. How do you feel your institution would have felt about the co-op education program if external funding had not been available?

1 IT WOULD HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED AN INTERESTING IDEA, BUT IT WOULD NOT HAVE EVER RECEIVED ANY SERIOUS ATTENTION.

2 IT WOULD NEVER HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED OR DISCUSSED.

3 IT WOULD HAVE BEEN ADOPTED ANYWAY WITHIN A YEAR.

4 IT WOULD HAVE BEEN ADOPTED SOMETIME IN THE FUTURE.

5 OTHER, SPECIFY _____

_____

69. Has the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission ever taken an active role in your co-op program?

1 YES, SPECIFY HOW _____

_____

2 NO

70. What is the source of your current funding? _____

_____

APPENDIX C

LETTER REQUESTING SUPPORT

Date

Inside Address

Salutation:

Over the past ten years, the concept of co-operative education has gained enormous popularity. The success of co-operative education programs in institutions across Canada has initiated a serious study by this department into the feasibility of implementing similar programs in post-secondary technology and adult education technician level training institutions in our province. Co-operative education programs are now in place in several of our universities, but so far we do not have any programs in place at the technical level.

It is our hope that a feasibility study will facilitate the planning and implementation stages of functional co-operative education programs at the technical school level. Our research plan has two main phases. The first phase focuses of gathering information from institutions which now have successful co-operative programs in place. The second phase will concentrate on applying this knowledge to Nova Scotian conditions.

I am writing to ask you for your support in procuring planning and implementation information about your co-operative education programs. We are constructing a questionnaire which we would like to have completed by your director of co-operative education. If that position does not exist at you institution, perhaps you could suggest a person with whom we could communicate. We will keep all information confidential but would be happy to share our final report with you at the conclusion of the study.

I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely

Julie M. Thomson
Research Assistant

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE MAILING LIST

Mr. Al Spriggs
Co-ordinator, Co-operative Education Dept.
Algonquin College of Applied
Arts & Technology
1385 Woodroffe Avenue
Nepean, Ontario
K2G 1V8

Mr. Paul H. King
Dean of College Programs
Confederation College
P.O. Box 398, Postal Station "F"
Thunder Bay, Ontario
P7C 4W1

Mr. John G. Sim
Manager Co-op Education & Placement
Fanshawe College
P.O. Box 4005
London, Ontario
N5W 5H1

Mr. Charles Joyner
Dean of Engineering
Technologies and Physical Ed.
Dawson College
535 Viger Street
Montreal, Quebec
H2L 2P3

Ms. Margaret Watson, Chairman
Employer Services
Georgian College
1 Georgian Drive
Barrie, Ontario
L4M 3X9

Captain Michotte
Assistant Director
Institut de Marine
du Cegep de Rimouski
53 rue Saint-Germain Ouest
Rimouski, Quebec
G5L 4B4

Mr. Terry Cameron
Manager, College Marketing & Devel.
Lambton College
P.O. Box 969
Sarnia, Ontario
N7T 7K4

Mr. Gordon Partridge
Chairman of Co-operative Education
Mohawk College of Applied Arts & Technology
134 Fennell Avenue West
P.O. Box 2034
Hamilton, Ontario
L8N 3T2

Ms. Rosemarie Cawthorne
Placement and Co-operative Education Director
Niagara College of Applied Arts & Technology
P.O. Box 1005, Woodlawn Road
Welland, Ontario
L3B 5S2

Mr. Cy Howard, Director
Red River Community College
2055 Notre Dame Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3H 0J9

Mr. V. E. Burgess
Chairman, Co-operative Education
St. Clair College
2000 Talbot Road West
Windsor, Ontario
N9A 6S4

Mr. Mike Metcalf
Co-operative Administrator
Business Department, St. Lawrence College
Windmill Point
Cornwall, Ontario
K6H 4Z1

Mr. Joseph Williams, Manager
Marketing & Placement
Sault College of Applied Arts & Technology
443 Northern Avenue
P.O. Box 60
Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario
P6A 5L3

Mr. F. W. Etherden
Senior Campus Dean
Seneca College of Applied Arts & Technology
1750 Finch Avenue, E.
Willowdale, Ontario
M2J 2X5

POOR

QUALITY

ORIGINAL